

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed March 21, 2008, ("the Office Action") has been received and its contents carefully considered. Claims 1-10 and 12-24 are pending. Claims 1-9 stand rejected. Without conceding to the propriety of these rejections, claim 1 has been amended. Specific support for these amendments is found, at least, in FIG. 3 and at paragraph 33. Claims 10 and 11-24 have been withdrawn from consideration.

The Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following amendments and remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. All the pending claims at issue are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Withdrawal of outstanding objection and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks.

Examiner Interview (June 12, 2008)

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for her exemplary assistance during the Examiner Interview conducted on June 12, 2008 at the US Patent Office. In the Examiner Interview, it was suggested that the amending claim 1 to include the insert shown in FIG. 3 may further distinguish from the art of reference. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) (U.S. 2005/0081692 to Krzysztof Mosiewicz)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. U.S. 2005/0081692 to Krzysztof Mosiewicz (Hereinafter referred to as, "Mosiewicz"). The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 1 obviate the foregoing rejection.

Accordingly, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom for at least the following reasons.

Initially, Applicant notes that it is axiomatic that to qualify as an anticipation under Section 102, the cited reference must “bear within its four corners adequate directions for the practice of the patent invalidated.” (See, for example, Dewey & Almay Chemical Co. v. Mimex Co., Inc., 52 U.S.P.Q. 138 (2nd Cir. 1942)). Applicant respectfully submits that Mosiewicz embodies no such directions.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, [a]n anvil for providing support to a backed ply material during a cutting operation ... the anvil comprising ... a rigid base for securing the anvil to a cutting assembly, an inverted “T” shaped channel in the rigid base and coinciding with the path, a “T” shaped insert to mate with the channel, a surface on the insert to support the backed ply material, the surface being secured to the base, and a groove disposed upon the surface and coinciding with the path, ... wherein a backing of the backed ply material is urged into the groove during the cutting operation. Mosiewicz does not disclose an inverted “T” shaped channel nor does Mosiewicz disclose a mating “T” shaped insert. As such, Mosiewicz fails to disclose the application as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. Therefore, the present invention is patentably distinct from Mosiewicz.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection to claim 1 as being anticipated by Mosiewicz is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 3,683,736 to Guenter H. Loose)

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 3,683,736 to Guenter H. Loose. Initially, the Applicants note that claims 2-4 depend from independent claim 1 and that claim 1 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated hereinabove. Applicants further note that any claim that depends from an allowable claim is also allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claims 2-4 be removed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,720,058 to Weeks et al.)

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,720,058 to Weeks et al. Initially, the Applicants note that claim 5 depends from independent claim 1 and that claim 1 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated hereinabove. Applicants further note that any claim that depends from an allowable claim is also allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 5 be removed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,720,058 to Weeks et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No.: 3,645,304 to Thrasher)

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,720,058 to Weeks et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No.: 3,645,304 to Thrasher. Initially, the Applicants note that claim 6 depends from independent claim 1 and that claim 1 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated hereinabove. Applicants further note that

any claim that depends from an allowable claim is also allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 6 be removed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,720,058 to Weeks et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No.: 5,072,640 to Greve et al.)

Claims 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,720,058 to Weeks et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No.: 5,072,640 to Greve et al. Initially, the Applicants note that claims 7-8 depend from independent claim 1 and that claim 1 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated hereinabove. Applicants further note that any claim that depends from an allowable claim is also allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claims 7-8 be removed.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,720,058 to Weeks et al. and U.S. Patent No.: 5,072,640 to Greve et al. further in view of U.S. Patent No.: 4,438,698 to Sullivan, Jr. et al.)

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Mosiewicz in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,720,058 to Weeks et al. and U.S. Patent No.: 5,072,640 to Greve et al. further in view of U.S. Patent No.: 4,438,698 to Sullivan, Jr. et al. Initially, the Applicants note that claim 9 depends from independent claim 1 and that claim 1 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons stated hereinabove. Applicants further note that any claim that depends from an allowable claim is also allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 9 be removed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application are believed in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in expediting prosecution of the application; the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 202-861-1629.

Respectfully submitted,
Baker & Hostetler LLP



Michael D. Graham
Reg. No. 51,750

Dated: August 20, 2008
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1629
Facsimile: 202-861-1783